SECTION 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The CEQA Guidelines give extensive direction on identifying and evaluating alternatives to a proposed project in an EIR [§15126.6]. The purpose of having alternatives in an EIR is to identify ways to substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects that a proposed project may have on the environment. The range of alternatives selected for analysis is governed by the "rule of reason", which requires the EIR to discuss only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Although the alternatives do not have to meet every goal and objective set for the proposed project, they should "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project".

The Guidelines specifically require consideration of a "No Project" Alternative. The purpose in including a No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the project or not approving the project. The Guidelines specifically advise that the No Project Alternative be "what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." The Guidelines emphasize that an EIR should take a practical approach, and not "...create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment." [§15126.6(e)(3)(B)]

The discussion of alternatives should include enough information to allow a meaningful evaluation and comparison with the proposed project. The Guidelines state that if an alternative would cause one or more additional impacts, compared to the proposed project, the discussion should identify the additional impact, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project.

In addition to the No Project Alternative, the Guidelines advise that the range of alternatives discussed in the EIR should be limited to those that "would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" [§15126.6(f)]. Factors that may be taken into account in considering the feasibility of an alternative include "...site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries...and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site...." [§15126.6 (f)(1)]

CEQA does not require that all possible alternatives be evaluated, only that "a range of feasible alternatives" be discussed, so as to encourage both meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. In selecting alternatives to be evaluated, consideration may be given to their potential for reducing significant unavoidable impacts, reducing significant impacts that are mitigated by the project to less than significant levels, and further reducing less than significant impacts.

5.1.1 Project Objectives

The primary objective of the CVSP project is to provide for a minimum development of 50,000 industry-driving jobs and 25,000 dwelling units within the North and Mid-Coyote Valley areas, consistent with the San José 2020 General Plan and the City Council's Vision Statement for the CVSP, as previously described in Section 1.4, *Project Objectives*. The urban community proposed should be highly livable with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial and job centers, and other community services. Twenty percent of the housing

must be affordable (below market rate). The Vision Statement also declares that the line (Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary) between the Urban Reserve and the Greenbelt (at Palm Avenue) shall not be moved, thus ensuring that the Greenbelt will continue to be preserved as a permanent, non-urban buffer between San José and Morgan Hill.

The specific project objectives include:

1. The Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) will include Central (Urban Reserve) and North (Campus Industrial) Coyote for land planning and will include South Coyote in the infrastructure financing mechanism only. South Coyote (Greenbelt) is included only to determine financing and other mechanisms to secure this as a permanent Greenbelt.

2. The line (Urban Growth Boundary/Greenline) between Central and South Coyote shall not be moved.

3. The line between North and Central could be erased to allow for mixed-use throughout, as long as 25,000 housing units in Central and 50,000 jobs in North remain as a base. Then, jobs can be added in Central Coyote and housing in North Coyote to achieve mixed-use or develop a property owner agreement to "trade" jobs and housing counts to achieve mixed-use goals.

4. The overall development character of North and Central Coyote Valley should be very urban, pedestrian and transit-oriented community with a mixture of housing densities, supportive businesses and services and campus industrial uses.

5. The Specific Plan should plan for the extension of light rail and heavy rail into Central Coyote and use these facilities to orient development.

6. The Specific Plan shall maximize efficient land usage; i.e., the 25,000 units and 50,000 jobs are both minimums. In North and Central Coyote combined, the total development potential is at least 50,000 jobs and at least 25,000 housing units. Through the Specific Plan process the City shall determine the distribution of that potential across north and mid, including mixed-use concepts.

7. The Specific Plan will distinguish that the 50,000 jobs referenced are primarily industrial/office jobs, not the additional retail support or public/quasi-public jobs (e.g., government jobs) that must also be accommodated in the CVSP Area for a vibrant, mixed-used, urban community.

8. The Specific Plan will identify locations for public facilities (libraries, parks, schools, etc.) in the land use plan as well as include these facilities in the financing plan.

9. North and Central Coyote should contain a rich system of parks, trails, and recreation areas.

10. The Specific Plan will include identification of financing measures for the needed capital improvements to support the planned levels of development.

11. The Specific Plan must be financially feasible for private development.

12. The Specific Plan must develop trigger mechanisms to ensure that increments of housing may not move forward until the appropriate number of jobs is constructed in a parallel timeline to maintain a jobs/housing balance in Coyote Valley.

13. The Task Force should review the potential to utilize "sub-regions" of the valley that will incorporate jobs and housing that can move forward when the subregion has the ability to finance the appropriate infrastructure. Residential projects will be issued building permits in parallel with the development of jobs when either the projects are purely mixed-use in their construction or the jobs and housing are constructed simultaneously.

14. The Specific Plan should seek mechanisms to facilitate the permanent acquisition of fee title or conservation easements in South Coyote.

15. The Specific Plan should allow for the current General Plan budget triggers to be changed to triggers based upon the Valley or its sub-region's jobs and housing revenues covering the General Fund cost of services.

16. The Specific Plan shall include a requirement that will mandate 20 percent of all units be "deed-restricted, below-market-rate units.

5.1.2 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The CEQA Guidelines advise that the alternatives analysis in an EIR should be limited to alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant direct and indirect effects of the project and would achieve most of the project objectives. This EIR identifies the following significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the project as it is proposed and if no mitigation measures are available: loss of 2,400 acres of agricultural land; impacts to freeway segments; long-term traffic impacts; regional air quality impacts and 2005 Ozone Strategy inconsistency; construction-related and off-site roadway noise impacts; impacts to and loss of habitat for Burrowing Owls; loss of ordinance-size trees; potential loss of Heritage Trees; visual and aesthetic impacts; and increased energy use. These significant unavoidable impacts are listed in Section 8.0, *Significant Unavoidable Impacts*.

In addition, the project would have a number of significant impacts for which mitigation is identified in the EIR that reduces these impacts to a less than significant level, including:

- Construction-related traffic and air and water quality impacts;
- Impacts to signalized and unsignalized intersections outside of the CVSP Area;
- Noise impacts within the CVSP Area;
- Vibration impacts from the UPRR tracks;
- Impacts to subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources;
- Loss of sensitive biological habitats including wetlands, oak woodlands, and grasslands;
- Impacts to special status plant and animal species;
- Disturbance of nesting raptors and bats;
- Introduction of non-native species into water bodies;
- Impacts to wildlife migration during construction;
- Loss of habitat and wildlife species associated with NOx emissions;
- Exposure to seismic hazards associated with the potential location near the Shannon Fault within the CVSP Development Area;
- Long-term water quality impacts; and
- Impacts associated with past and existing hazardous materials contamination on properties proposed for park, school and residential use.

Most of the significant unavoidable impacts anticipated to occur if the project is implemented as proposed are directly related to the amount of new development that would occur (a minimum of 25,000 housing units and 50,000 jobs on approximately 3,800 acres). Reducing the size of the project would generally reduce the significance of the impacts, such as traffic, air quality, and noise. Some of the impacts result from the project location, particularly the loss of prime and important farmlands, and impacts to biological and cultural resources. Even those impacts related to location may be reduced by reducing the overall size of the project and leaving some sites undeveloped.

5.1.3 Variations of Alternatives

It is not possible for any EIR to discuss every possible alternative, and every possible variation of an alternative, and CEQA does not require that it do so [§15126.6(a)]. It would, however, be possible to combine some of the alternatives, if the Lead Agency wished to do so.

The alternatives discussed below include:

1) No Project Alternative;
2) Reduced Scale Alternative I: Development in NCCIA only;
3) Reduced Scale Alternative II: Development in NCCIA and Urban Reserve;
4) Design Alternative (Framework Elements of the Greenbelt Alliance's "Getting it Right" Plan); and
5) Alternative Location in North San José.

Infrastructure Alternatives are described within the various alternatives.

5.2 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines specifically require consideration of a "No Project" Alternative. The purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow the project decision-makers to compare the impacts of not approving the project with the impacts of approving the project as it is proposed.

Existing San Jose 2020 General Plan policies and Land Use/Transportation Diagram designations allow the development of the approximately 1,700-acre North Coyote Campus Industrial Area (NCCIA) with up to 50,000 jobs. The Campus Industrial designation is intended to support development of large, single-user industrial sites through a master Planned Development Zoning for each site. Projects are required to be consistent with the North Coyote Valley Campus Industrial Master Development Plan. For purposes of sizing the required infrastructure for North Coyote Valley, the land area is assumed to accommodate 50,000 employees based on an employee density of 40 employees per acre.

Four Planned Development (PD) zonings are currently approved in North Coyote Valley. Construction of the existing IBM facility, located on the north side of Bailey Avenue, was approved under a 1974 PD zoning. There are two projects for properties (Xilinx and Sobrato) under PD zonings that were approved in the mid-1980s but have not been constructed and are not currently active with approved PD permits. The most recently approved project is the CVRP project which was approved in 2000. The total number of industrial jobs represented by these four approved projects is approximately 35,000 employees.

Planned Development (PD) zoning and PD permits are only active for the CVRP project that would allow the construction of approximately 6.6 million square feet of campus industrial uses to accommodate approximately 20,000 employees on approximately 688 acres (385 net acres) of the

NCCIA as part of the CVRP project.[76] The remaining 303 acres of the CVRP include Fisher Creek and Laguna Seca, open space, and the flood control facilities. Building heights would range between two and eight stories, with a minimum building size of 50,000 square feet. The overall floor area ratio (FARs) would be approximately 0.23 over the site (net without public streets).

For the purposes of this discussion, the No Project Alternative includes no changes to the existing Campus Industrial San José 2020 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for North Coyote Valley, anticipated 50,000 jobs and the approved Master Development Plan. This alternative also includes the development of the CVRP project in the NCCIA, the environmental impacts of which were previously disclosed in the Coyote Valley Research Park EIR and findings were made regarding the significant unavoidable impacts of that project (loss of agricultural land, impacts to freeway segments, roadway and construction noise impacts, loss of Heritage Trees, and visual impacts).[77] Implementation of the CVRP project or the additional 30,000 jobs would not require the extension of the City's Urban Service Area, or prezoning and annexation of the Urban Reserve to the City of San José. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include the construction of the Bailey-over-the-Hill roadway extension, focal lake, urban canal, additional interchange on US 101, bridge crossings of Coyote Creek, or relocation and restoration of Fisher Creek.

5.2.1 Comparison of Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

5.2.1.1 *Loss of Agricultural Lands*

The significant unavoidable land use impact of the CVSP project is the loss of approximately 2,400 acres of prime and important farmlands, as described in Section 4.1.2.8 of this EIR. The CVRP EIR identified the loss of approximately 688 acres of prime agricultural lands to be a significant and unavoidable impact of the project. The development of an additional 30,000 jobs would most likely result in the loss of the remaining approximately 277 acres of farmland in the NCCIA, for a total loss of 965 acres. When compared to the CVRP project, the proposed project would result in the loss of an additional 1,435 acres of prime or important farmland. The No Project Alternative would result in the loss of approximately one-quarter of the agricultural lands lost with the CVSP Project.

5.2.1.2 *Traffic*

As described in Section 4.2, *Transportation and Traffic* of this EIR, the proposed CVSP project would result in significant unavoidable impacts on eight directional freeway segments under project conditions. As described in the CVRP EIR, the CVRP project would result in a significant unavoidable impact on one freeway segment during the PM peak hour: US 101 between State Route 85 to the southbound lane drop in the southbound direction. Other impacts would also be expected from the development of the additional 30,000 jobs included in the San José 2020 General Plan.

It is expected that the No Project Alternative would result in fewer significant unavoidable traffic impacts than the proposed CVSP project, because the No Project Alternative does not include 25,000 housing units. It should be noted that the No Project alternative would not encourage traffic trips in the reverse commute (non-peak) direction, or result in the internalization of traffic trips to the same extent as the proposed CVSP project.

[76] City of San José, Coyote Valley Research Park, PDC99-06-053, granted in the fall of 2000. It should be noted that while PD zonings do not expire, PD Permits do.
[77] City of San José, certified fall of 2000, California State Clearinghouse Number 990923031.

The long-term traffic analysis for the CVSP project determined that the project would result in significant impacts on screenlines according to the City's screenline impact criteria, as described in Section 4.2 of this EIR. While the CVRP project included changes to the General Plan roadway network and other changes could be required for the additional 30,000 jobs in the NCCIA, the environmental review for that change was included in a previous EIR (1998 General Plan Annual Review). The CVRP EIR concluded that the CVRP-proposed changes to the roadway network would not result in a significant increase in traffic over the then existing General Plan assumptions. For this reason, the proposed CVSP project would result in significantly greater traffic impacts when compared to the No Project Alternative.

5.2.1.3 *Noise*

As described in Section 4.3, *Noise*, the CVSP project would result in two significant unavoidable noise impacts: construction-related impacts and roadway noise impacts to areas outside of the CVSP area. These two impacts were also identified in the CVRP EIR as significant unavoidable impacts of that project. The additional 30,000 jobs included in the San José 2020 General Plan would contribute towards this impact.

CVSP noise impacts during construction would occur over a longer time period and greater number of acres, and would affect more of the existing Coyote Valley residential areas, especially those in the southeastern portion of the CVSP Development Area. The CVSP project would generate a larger number of vehicle trips when compared to the No Project Alternative. Therefore, off-site roadway noise impacts would be greater. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer noise impacts when compared to the CVSP project.

5.2.1.4 *Air Quality*

In the Bay Area, air pollution is primarily associated with traffic and traffic congestion, which occurs as a result of the volume of cars approaching or exceeding the capacity of the roadways. Air pollution can increase if congestion increases the length of the commute trip and/or results in cars idling in traffic. Because both the No Project and CVSP projects would generate criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and PM_{10}, both projects would result in significant unavoidable long-term regional air quality impacts. Because the CVSP project would generate significantly more vehicle trips when compared to the No Project Alternative, air quality impacts would be greatly reduced with the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative does not propose residential development and is therefore, consistent with the 2000 Bay Area Clean Air Plan and the 2005 Ozone Strategy. The proposed CVSP project would result in an increase in population in San José not accounted for in the San José 2020 General Plan, and is therefore inconsistent with the CAP and the Ozone Strategy. This is a significant unavoidable impact.

5.2.1.5 *Biological Resources*

The CVRP project would result in impacts to wetlands; however, these impacts were mitigated to a less than significant level. In addition, the CVRP project would not result in impacts to Burrowing Owls or the loss of Burrowing Owl habitat. The development of the additional 30,000 jobs would contribute towards these impacts and could increase their severity. The proposed CVSP project could result in impacts to Burrowing Owls due to loss of individuals during construction, loss of habitat, increased predation, widening and construction of roadways, and nest disturbance.

Based on the tree survey prepared for the CVSP project, the No Project Alternative would result in the loss of approximately 350 ordinance-size trees, including twelve Keesling walnut trees, although it is now believed that these trees could potentially be saved. According to the tree survey prepared for accessible properties within the CVSP, the proposed CVSP project could result in the loss of more than 888 ordinance-size trees. In addition, although the Keesling walnut trees are proposed to be protected with the CVSP project, should they die as a result of construction activities, their loss would be a significant unavoidable impact. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts to biological resources when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.2.1.6 *Visual and Aesthetics*

As described in the CVRP EIR, the No Project Alternative would result in significant unavoidable visual and aesthetic impacts due to the conversion of approximately 1,700 acres of rural land to urban uses. Floor area ratios (FARs) with the CVRP would be approximately 0.23 and building heights would be between two and eight stories. Surface parking would be included, and approximately 25% of each parcel will be landscaped.

The proposed CVSP project would result in the conversion of up to approximately 3,800 acres of rural land to urban uses. The CVSP FARs would be up to 9.0, and building heights up to 20 stories. Due to the development densities proposed with the CVSP project, it is expected that substantially less than 25% of each parcel would be landscaped. The CVSP project would substantially change the existing visual and aesthetic character of the Coyote Valley area, including views from scenic roadways. Because the No Project Alternative would result in the development of fewer acres with less intense uses (i.e., lower FARs, shorter buildings and more landscaping), it would result in a less substantial change in the existing visual character, and therefore, reduced visual and aesthetic impacts when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.2.1.7 *Energy Use*

The No Project Alternative would result in the use of less energy when compared to the proposed CVSP project due to the fact that it would result in less development and fewer vehicle trips. Although the CVSP project would allow for utilization of roadway capacity in the non-peak direction and the internalization of trips, the No Project Alternative would generate significantly fewer vehicle trips. Electricity, natural gas, and gasoline consumption would be greatly reduced under the existing San José 2020 General Plan (No Project) Alternative.

5.2.1.8 *Other Impacts*

All other environmental impacts that result from the implementation of the CVSP project would be reduced or avoided by the No Project Alternative due to the fact that a reduced level of development would occur on fewer acres. Less traffic would be generated, resulting in proportionately fewer air pollutant emissions, including indirect impacts associated with NOx deposition. Less noise would also be generated and fewer existing residential uses in the CVSP Development Area would be affected by short- and long-term noise. Vibration impacts would also be reduced.

Under the No Project Alternative, residential development would not occur in proximity to the proposed CVRP campus industrial project, resulting in a reduced potential for land use compatibility impacts. Construction-related and long-term air and water quality impacts and impacts to prehistoric, historic, and biological resources would be significantly reduced.

While impacts to biological resources including oak woodland, serpentine grasslands, and riparian habitat as well as impacts to special status plant and animals species would be reduced overall under

the CVRP (No Project Alternative) and impacts to wetlands located in the southwestern portion of the NCCIA would not be impacted by development. Impacts associated with urban development in proximity to a potentially active earthquake fault and properties with potential hazardous materials contamination would also be reduced. Finally, services, utilities, and infrastructure, including roadways and a flood control system, would not need to be extended to the Urban Reserve which could reduce impacts associated with the construction/installation of these facilities.

It should be noted that the No Project Alternative would not include the relocation and restoration of Fisher Creek through the CVSP Development Area. Therefore, existing Fisher Creek would remain in its current location and condition. The existing creek would not be impacted as a result of relocation; the CVSP project would result in improvements to the functions and values of this creek which would not occur under the No Project Alternative. Because less development is included in this alternative, impacts associated with wildlife movement would be reduced. The No Project Alternative would also not require the construction of schools and other public facilities. Water requirements would be less with the No Project Alternative.

5.2.1.9 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The No Project Alternative would deliver 50,000 jobs but not any of the mixed use objectives of the proposed project. It would not result in the development of a highly livable urban community with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial uses, and other community services. This alternative is consistent with the existing adopted San José 2020 General Plan policies and Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation. It would improve the City's jobs to housing balance because 20,000 jobs are included in the CVRP project, with an additional 30,000 planned for in the General Plan for the remainder of the NCCIA and would foster the reverse commute pattern to better maximize use of the existing lanes on US 101. This alternative could result in an increase in pressure to develop residential uses elsewhere in San José and the region.

5.2.1.10 *Feasibility*

The No Project Alternative would be developed through implementation of the existing policies and Planned Development permits of the CVRP project, and future industrial conformance with the San José 2020 General Plan policies for the *Campus Industrial* designation. It would be feasible from an approval and implementation standpoint.

5.2.1.11 *Conclusion*

The No Project Alternative would include industrial build-out in the NCCIAS under the existing San José 2020 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation of *Campus Industrial*, as well as the development of the CVRP project under existing General Plan designations, zonings, and city policies and ordinances. This alternative does not support the project's goals and objectives. This alternative is potentially feasible, and is environmentally superior to the proposed project.

5.3 REDUCED SCALE ALTERNATIVE I: 20,000 JOBS AND 10,000 HOUSING UNITS IN NORTH COYOTE VALLEY

Although many variations of a Reduced Scale Alternative could be considered in this discussion, the Reduced Scale Alternative evaluated in this alternative is the construction of approximately 20,000 jobs and 10,000 housing units within the NCCIA area of the CVSP Development Area. This Reduced Scale Alternative was chosen because there are current entitlements within the NCCIA for approximately 20,000 jobs (6.6 million square feet of campus industrial development) on

approximately 688 gross acres of the 1,700-acre north Coyote Valley area and an additional 30,000 jobs are included in the San José 2020 General Plan. The entitled CVRP campus industrial project and 10,000 dwelling units is a similar proportion of jobs to housing as the approximately 55,000 jobs and 26,000 dwelling units proposed by the CVSP project.

This Reduced Scale Alternative I includes the two following development scenarios: 1) Segregated Uses scenario: industrial development consistent with existing PD permits could occur on the CVRP properties with residential uses developed on properties primarily south of Bailey Avenue, and surrounding the existing IBM facility (approximately 1,000 gross acres); or 2) Mixed Uses scenario: a planned community, similar in design to the CVSP but smaller in scale, could be implemented where land uses are integrated to create an urban, pedestrian, and transit-oriented mixed use community in North Coyote Valley. "Workplace" uses, including R&D and office, rather than the CVRP campus industrial uses, would comprise the 20,000 jobs.

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would not require an expansion of the Urban Service Area or annexation of the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve. General Plan amendments would be required to remove approximately 30,000 jobs from the General Plan to allow residential uses in the NCCIA. The flood control system for the development of the NCCIA, including the areas south of Bailey Avenue, has been approved, permitted, and is currently under construction. This system would be able to accommodate the approximately 20,000 jobs and 10,000 residential units in the NCCIA.[78] Therefore, Fisher Creek would not be relocated and restored and the lake and urban canal would not be built.

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would not require the construction of the Bailey-over-the-Hill roadway extension. The Bailey Avenue interchange and connection to Monterey Road was recently constructed for the CVRP project and is considered to be sufficient to serve the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios.[79] Therefore, the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would not require the construction of the new interchange at Coyote Valley Parkway (existing Scheller Avenue), improvements to the existing interchange at Coyote Golf Course Drive, or the corresponding roadway connections that include bridges over Coyote Creek. In addition, an internal fixed guideway BRT system may not be required or financially feasible. The construction of a Caltrain station could still be included in these scenarios, and the extension of the VTA LRT to the valley could be considered.

It is anticipated that the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would include commercial uses, parks, and schools. Other public services, including fire stations and libraries, may or may not be required depending upon the amount and type of development considered. These Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would not include the development of lands on the east side of Monterey Road, which are outside of the NCCIA.

The difference between the No Project Alternative and the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios is the construction of 10,000 housing units and only 20,000 jobs in the NCCIA instead of 50,000 jobs. The construction of 10,000 dwelling units on approximately 1,000 gross acres would yield a gross average density of approximately 10 dwelling units per acre. Some amount of commercial and public/quasi-public development would be expected to serve the residential uses under these scenarios. When these ancillary uses are added to the 1,000 gross acres, the average residential density would be greater than 10 dwelling units per acre.

[78] Personal communication, Bill Wagner, President, HMH Engineers and Chuck Anderson, Vice President, Schaaf & Wheeler, February 2007.
[79] Personal communication, Bill Wagner, President, HMH Engineers, February 2007.

5.3.1 Comparison of Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

5.3.1.1 *Land Use*

As previously described, the CVRP project would result in the loss of approximately 688 acres of prime farmland. As shown on Figure 4.1-3, the construction of 10,000 dwelling units on the remaining 1,000 gross acres of the NCCIA would result the additional loss of approximately 277 acres of prime or important farmlands, for a total of 965 acres, as shown in Table 4.1-3. The proposed CVSP project would result in impacts from the loss of approximately 2,400 acres of Prime or Important Farmlands. Therefore, the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would result in the loss of significantly fewer acres of agricultural lands, when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.3.1.2 *Traffic*

As described in the CVRP EIR, the CVRP project would result in a significant unavoidable impact on the US 101 freeway segment between State Route 85 to the southbound lane drop in the southbound direction during the PM peak hour. The two Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would result in the construction of 10,000 residential uses, and the trips generated by these residential units would be added to the traffic impacts of the CVRP. As described in Section 4.2, *Transportation and Traffic* of this EIR, the proposed CVSP project, which includes 26,500 jobs and an additional 35,000 jobs when compared to the CVRP project, would result in significant unavoidable impacts on eight directional freeway segments under project conditions. Therefore, given the CVRP project would include substantially less development and the generation of substantially less traffic, traffic impacts of the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would be significantly less than the proposed CVSP project. As with the proposed project, the construction of 10,000 dwelling units in proximity to jobs would allow the internalization of vehicle trips.

The long-term traffic analysis for the CVSP project determined that the project would result in significant impacts on screenlines according to the City's screenline impact criteria, as described in Section 4.2 of this EIR. The CVRP EIR concluded that changes to the roadway network would not result in a significant increase in traffic over the existing General Plan. While the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would require General Plan amendments and additional analysis would be required, it can be assumed that the scenarios would result in significantly reduced long-term traffic impacts because they include significantly less development than the proposed CVSP project.

5.3.1.3 *Noise*

As previously described, the CVSP project would result in two significant unavoidable impacts associated with the generation of construction-related and roadway noise. These two impacts were also identified in the CVRP EIR as significant unavoidable impacts of that project. Given the larger size of the CVSP project, however, it would result in greater noise impacts. Although the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would result in greater construction and roadway noise than the CVRP project, due to the addition of 10,000 dwelling units, CVSP noise impacts during construction would occur over a longer time period and greater number of acres. In addition, CVSP construction noise would affect more of the existing residential areas, especially those in the southeastern portion of the CVSP Development Area.

Roadway noise generated by the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would not affect the existing residential area of Coyote Valley because of the number of trips to be generated and their directionality. In addition, these residences are not located on major streets, which would be expected to accommodate most of the traffic. Roadway noise impacts of the CVSP project would be

greater due to the larger number of vehicle trips generated. For these reasons, the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would result in reduced noise impacts, when compared to the CVSP project.

5.3.1.4 *Air Quality*

According to the BAAQMD CEQA guidelines, the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios and CVSP project would each generate criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and PM_{10}. Therefore, each of the alternative scenarios and the proposed CVSP project would result in significant unavoidable long-term regional direct air quality impacts. Nevertheless, the CVSP project would generate significantly more vehicle trips, air quality impacts would be reduced with the two alternative scenarios. It should be noted that the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would include 10,000 dwelling units in the NCCIA, which could serve to reduce the number of commute vehicle trips and trip lengths to residential units located in San José to the north, or in Morgan Hill, Gilroy, and other locations to the south.

Both the proposed CVSP project and the Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios are inconsistent with the CAP and 2005 Ozone Strategy because residential units in the Urban Reserve or NCCIA were not anticipated in the San José 2020 General Plan. The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios, however, would result in fewer residential units and, therefore, a smaller inconsistency.

5.3.1.5 *Biological Resources*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios have the potential to result in impacts to Burrowing Owls, because they include development of areas that were not surveyed for Burrowing Owl habitat as part of the CVRP project. The lands south of Bailey Avenue and surrounding the IBM facility (approximately 756 acres) have the potential to be Burrowing Owl habitat, although no Burrowing Owls were identified on accessible portions of these lands as part of the CVSP analysis.

As described in Section 4.6, *Biological Resources*, the proposed CVSP project could result in impacts to Burrowing Owls due to loss of individuals during construction, loss of habitat, increased predation, widening and construction of roadways, and nest disturbance. In addition, approximately 1,130 acres of the CVSP Development Area could be Burrowing Owl habitat which would be lost with the development of the CVSP. Therefore, the two alternative scenarios would result in the potential loss of approximately one-third fewer acres of potential Burrowing Owl habitat, when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

Based on the CVRP EIR and the tree survey of accessible properties of the CVSP Development Area prepared as part of this EIR, the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would result in the loss of approximately 350 ordinance-size trees, including twelve Keesling walnut trees. The proposed CVSP project could result in the loss of at least 888 ordinance-size trees, potentially including the Keesling walnut trees. Both the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios and the CVSP project could result in the loss of a significant number of ordinance-size, Heritage Trees, and candidate Heritage Trees; however, the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would result in the loss of fewer trees when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.3.1.6 *Visual and Aesthetics*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would result in significant unavoidable visual and aesthetic impacts due to the conversion of approximately 1,700 rural acres to urban uses, resulting in a significant unavoidable visual impact. The proposed CVSP project would result in the conversion of up to approximately 3,800 acres of rural acres to urban uses and would substantially change the

existing visual and aesthetic character of the Coyote Valley area, including views from scenic roadways. Because the two alternative scenarios would result in the development of fewer acres with less intense uses, it would result in fewer visual and aesthetic impacts when compared to the proposed CVSP project, but the significant unavoidable impact would not be avoided.

5.3.1.7 *Energy Use*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would result in the direct consumption of less energy when compared to the proposed CVSP project due to the fact that it would result in less development.

5.3.1.8 *Other Impacts*

All other environmental impacts that result from the implementation of the CVSP project would be reduced or avoided by the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios due to the fact that less development would occur on fewer acres. Less traffic would be generated on roadways both within and outside of the NCCIA, resulting in fewer traffic impacts and air pollutant emissions, including NOx deposition. Construction-related and long-term local air and water quality impacts and potential impacts to prehistoric and historic resources would be significantly reduced. Vibration impacts would also be reduced because less development would be placed adjacent to the UPRR tracks.

While impacts to biological resources including oak woodland, serpentine grasslands, and riparian habitat as well as impacts to special status plant and animals species would be reduced overall, impacts to wetlands located in the southwestern portion of the NCCIA would still be impacted by development. Because less development is included in these alternative scenarios, impacts associated with wildlife movement would be reduced. Impacts associated with development in proximity to a potentially active earthquake fault and properties with potential hazardous materials contamination would also be reduced. Finally, services, utilities, and infrastructure, including roadways and a flood control system, would not need to be extended to the Urban Reserve which could reduce impacts associated with the construction/installation of these facilities, including impacts to Fisher Creek. Water supplies necessary to serve the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would also be less.

5.3.1.9 *Comparison of the Two Reduced Scale Scenarios*

The environmental impacts of developing the CVRP project were previously disclosed in the CVRP EIR and findings were made regarding the significant unavoidable impacts of that project (loss of agricultural land, freeway segments, roadway and construction noise, loss of Heritage Trees, and visual impacts).

When comparing the two Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios, each of which include the construction of 20,000 jobs and 10,000 housing units, it is assumed that each scenario would result in the loss of approximately the same number of acres of agricultural lands. The Segregated Uses scenario would result in the development of campus industrial uses, including manufacturing and assembly, in separate areas of the NCCIA, thereby minimizing the potential for land use incompatibility impacts to residents. Although the Mixed Uses scenario would combine land uses, the Workplace uses proposed are primarily office and R&D uses, which do not involve the use and storage of significant amounts of hazardous materials.

Impacts to freeway segments and long-term traffic impacts would be the same with the two alternative scenarios. It should be noted, however, that the Mixed Uses scenario has the potential to result in fewer internal traffic impacts when compared to the Segregated Uses scenario.

Incorporating Workplace and residential uses into a mixed use development tends to reduce trip lengths and encourages alternative means of transportation, such as walking or biking. Further, because air pollution in the Bay Area is associated with traffic and traffic congestion, mixing land uses and shortening or reducing vehicle trips would be expected to incrementally reduce air pollutant emissions. However, regional long-term air quality impacts could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Both scenarios would be inconsistent with the CAP and 2005 Ozone Strategy because they would add population not accounted for in the San José 2020 General Plan.

The two Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would result in the same impacts to Burrowing Owls and ordinance-size trees because both alternatives would require the development of the entire NCCIA. They would also use similar amounts of energy, although the Mixed Uses Alternative has the potential to require less gasoline because vehicle trips and trip lengths could be reduced, as described above.

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would be expected to have similar visual and aesthetic impacts, especially when viewed from scenic roadways. The impacts of both alternative scenarios would be significant and unavoidable. They would include the same land uses, but in different configurations and potentially, densities. The Segregated Uses scenario would have industrial buildings between two and eight stories on the CVRP properties in the northeastern portion of the NCCIA, and residential development could be constructed at various densities to the south and west of the CVRP project area. The Mixed Uses scenario could potentially have a greater mix of land use types, densities, and building heights, resulting in a different aesthetic. The visual change and blockage of views would be similar, however, each resulting in a significant unavoidable visual impact.

5.3.1.10 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would not be consistent with the basic objective of the CVSP project of constructing at least 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 industry-driving jobs as described in the City Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes statement. Some of the other identified objectives of the proposed project could be met with these two alternative scenarios, as described below. While the Mixed Uses Alternative could result in the development of a highly livable urban community with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial uses, and other community services in the North Coyote Valley area, the Segregated Uses Alternative also has the potential to meet some of these objectives.

The Reduced Scale Alternative Scenarios would be consistent with the project objectives relating to the provision of public facilities, including parks, and preservation of the South Coyote Greenbelt. While the implementation of these Scenarios would require General Plan amendments and rezonings, the intent of objectives 10 through 16 that relate to the sequencing and financing of development and the provision of affordable housing, could be met with less development within the NCCIA.

It should be noted that these Scenarios would not improve the City's jobs to housing balance to the same extent as the proposed CVSP project, because fewer jobs would be provided. In addition, the functions and values of Fisher Creek would not be improved because the creek would not be restored and realigned under the Reduced Scale Alternatives.

5.3.1.11 *Feasibility*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios, which would consist of developing only the NCCIA with jobs and residential uses, would be feasible from an approval and implementation standpoint.

5.3.1.12 *Conclusion*

The Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios would include the development of 10,000 residential units and the currently entitled 20,000 jobs in the NCCIA, on the west side of Monterey Road. While these alternative scenarios meet some of the project's goals and objectives and the intent of others, they do not meet the basic objective of planning for a minimum of 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 industry-driving jobs. It should be noted that the existing San José 2020 General Plan allows the construction of an additional 30,000 jobs in the NCCIA in addition to the 20,000 jobs currently permitted. These alternative scenarios are feasible and environmentally superior to the proposed project.

5.4 REDUCED SCALE ALTERNATIVE II: 20,000 JOBS AND 10,000 DWELLING UNITS IN NORTH AND MID-COYOTE VALLEY

Reduced Scale Alternative II is the construction of 20,000 jobs and 10,000 dwelling units over the entire approximately 3,800-acre CVSP Development Area. There are currently entitlements within the *North Coyote Campus Industrial* area for approximately 20,000 jobs on approximately 688 gross acres of the 1,700-acre north Coyote Valley area and together, with 10,000 dwelling units, this alternative provides a similar proportion of jobs to housing as the proposed project.

This Reduced Scale Alternative II could be constructed in one of two scenarios: 1) CVRP + Residential scenario: campus industrial development (20,000 jobs) could be constructed on the CVRP properties consistent with existing approvals, with the residential uses spread throughout the remaining CVSP Development Area (3,100 acres); or 2) Smaller CVSP scenario: a planned community similar in design to the CVSP but smaller in scale (approximately half the CVSP Development Area or 1,900 acres), could be implemented in a designated location within the CVSP Development Area, where uses are integrated to create an urban, pedestrian, and transit-oriented mixed use community.

The main purpose of considering these Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios is to examine how impacts within areas of the NCCIA and Urban Reserve could be reduced by avoiding development on agricultural lands or in areas with sensitive cultural and biological resources. Development densities would increase as sensitive areas are protected and left undeveloped.

These Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would require an expansion of the Urban Service Area boundary, and prezoning and annexation of the Urban Reserve. General Plan amendments would be required to remove approximately 30,000 jobs from the General Plan to allow residential uses in the NCCIA. The previously described flood control system currently under construction for the development of North Coyote Valley would not be able to accommodate the approximately 20,000 jobs and 10,000 residential units in areas outside of the NCCIA. Therefore, Fisher Creek could possibly be relocated and restored as part of a future flood control system. It is unknown if the alternative scenarios would require a lake and/or urban canal as components of the future flood control system.

These Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would not require the construction of the Bailey-over-the-Hill roadway extension. The Bailey Avenue interchange with US 101 and connection to Monterey Road was constructed for the CVRP project and, with minor improvements, is considered to be sufficient to serve the traffic generated by these Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios. Therefore, these scenarios would not require the construction of the new interchange at Coyote Valley Parkway or improvements to the existing interchange at Coyote Golf Course Drive, or the

corresponding connections that include bridges over Coyote Creek. In addition, an internal fixed guideway BRT system may not be required or financially feasible. The construction of a Caltrain station could still be included in these scenarios, and the extension of the VTA LRT to the valley could be considered.

It is anticipated that both Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would include commercial uses, parks, and schools. Other public services may or may not be required. These scenarios would not require the development of lands on the east side of Monterey Road.

As previously described, the impacts of developing approximately 688 acres of the NCCIA with campus industrial uses accommodating approximately 20,000 jobs were previously addressed in the CVRP EIR and were described previously in the No Project Alternative section. The difference between the No Project Alternative and the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios is the construction of 10,000 housing units.

5.4.1 Comparison of Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

5.4.1.1 *Land Use*

The significant unavoidable land use impacts of the proposed CVSP project include impacts from the loss of approximately 2,400 acres of prime agricultural lands. Both of the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios described above would result in the loss of fewer acres of Prime Farmland when compared to the proposed project. The CVRP + Residential Alternative would result in the loss of at least 688 acres of Prime or Important Farmlands, a significant unavoidable impact. The 10,000 residential units in this scenario could be built on the approximately 1,400 acres in the CVSP Development Area designated as Urban and Built-up, Grazing, and Other Land, which are not considered to be farmlands. In addition, residential development on Urban and Built-up Lands could be intensified with higher densities. At an average density of 16 dwelling units to the acre, the construction of 10,000 residential units would require approximately 625 acres. As shown on Figure 4.1-3, it is conceivable that Prime and Important Farmlands could be avoided under this scenario. As Prime and Important Farmlands are avoided, residential densities could increase.

The Smaller CVSP Alternative scenario would also reduce impacts to Prime and Important Farmlands because a smaller footprint would be required for development. Although some of the development could be placed on properties not designated as Prime or Important Farmlands, it is unlikely that these lands could be avoided completely, especially if the footprint is one cohesive unit. As with the CVRP + Residential Development Alternative, as farmlands are avoided, densities of all proposed uses could be expected to increase and other biologically or culturally sensitive properties could be affected by higher intensity development.

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in fewer land use impacts when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.4.1.2 *Traffic*

As previously described, the CVRP project would result in a significant unavoidable impact on the US 101 freeway segment between State Route 85 to the southbound lane drop in the southbound direction during the PM peak hour. The proposed CVSP project would result in significant unavoidable impacts on eight directional freeway segments under project conditions. The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in the construction of 10,000 dwelling uses, and the trips generated would be added to the traffic impacts of the CVRP. Therefore, the traffic impacts of the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios would be significantly less than the proposed CVSP project,

which includes 26,500 dwelling units and 55,000 jobs. As with the proposed project, the construction of 10,000 dwelling units in proximity to jobs would allow the internalization of some vehicle trips.

The long-term traffic analysis for the CVSP project determined that the project would result in significant impacts on screenlines according to the City's screenline impact criteria, as described in Section 4.2 of this EIR. The CVRP EIR concluded that changes to the roadway network will not result in a significant increase in traffic over the existing General Plan. While the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would require General Plan amendments and additional analysis will be required, it can be assumed that the scenarios would result in significantly fewer long-term traffic impacts when compared to the project CVSP project.

5.4.1.3 *Noise*

As previously described, the CVSP project would result in two significant unavoidable impacts associated with the generation of construction-related and roadway noise. These two impacts were also identified in the CVRP EIR as significant unavoidable impacts of that project. Given the size of the CVSP project, however, it would result in greater noise impacts. Although the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in additional construction and roadway noise due to the addition of 10,000 dwelling units, CVSP noise impacts during construction would occur over a longer time period and greater number of acres. In addition, CVSP construction noise would affect more of the existing residential areas, especially those in the southeastern portion of the CVSP Development Area. The alternative scenarios could also be located in such a way as to avoid noise impacts to the existing residential areas; however, as previously described, avoiding some areas could result in impacts to agricultural or culturally and biologically sensitive lands. Off-site roadway noise impacts would be greater due to the larger number of vehicle trips of the CVSP project. For these reasons, the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in fewer noise impacts when compared to the CVSP project.

5.4.1.4 *Air Quality*

The Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios II and CVSP project would each generate criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and PM_{10}. Therefore, they would result in significant unavoidable long-term regional air quality impacts. Air pollutant impacts of the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would be less than under the proposed CVSP, proportionate with the reduction in traffic of the alternative scenarios. It should be noted that including 10,000 dwelling units in the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios could reduce traffic trips from residential units located farther away in San José to the north, and jurisdictions to the south, from which workers would travel.

The proposed CVSP project and the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios are inconsistent with the CAP and 2005 Ozone Strategy because the residential units were not anticipated in the San José 2020 General Plan. The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios, however, propose fewer residential units, which would result in fewer air emissions when compared to the proposed CVSP project.

5.4.1.5 *Biological Resources*

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios have the potential to result in impacts to Burrowing Owls because they include the development of properties that were not surveyed for Burrowing Owl habitat as part of the CVRP or CVSP projects. While Burrowing Owls were not identified on the CVRP properties, the proposed CVSP project could result in impacts to Burrowing Owls due to loss of individuals during construction, loss of habitat, increased predation, widening and construction of

roadways, and nest disturbance. The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios could result in the loss of fewer acres of potential Burrowing Owl habitat when compared to the proposed CVSP project because fewer acres would be developed and avoidance could be possible.

The proposed CVSP project could result in the loss of at least 888 ordinance-size trees. The CVRP + Residential Alternative would result in the loss of at least 349 ordinance-size trees in addition to twelve Keesling walnut trees; a significant unavoidable impact. If the residential units assumed in the CVRP + Residential Alternative are placed in areas with few ordinance-size trees, the impacts would be significantly reduced. Similarly, the Smaller CVSP Alternative could be clustered among properties with fewer trees and impacts would be reduced. For these reasons, the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in fewer and less severe impacts to biological resources when compared to the proposed CVSP project because fewer acres and fewer resources would be affected.

It should be noted that avoiding properties with Burrowing Owl habitat and significant numbers of ordinance-size and Heritage Trees, could result in higher development densities and/or the development of Prime and Important Farmlands and culturally sensitive properties.

5.4.1.6 *Visual and Aesthetics*

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in significant unavoidable visual and aesthetic impacts due to the conversion of approximately 1,700 to 1,900 rural acres in Coyote Valley to urban uses, including views from scenic roadways. The proposed CVSP project would result in the conversion of up to approximately 3,800 acres of rural acres to urban uses and would substantially change the existing visual and aesthetic character of the Coyote Valley area, also affecting views from scenic roadways. Because the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in the development of fewer acres with less intense uses, it would result in reduced visual and aesthetic impacts when compared to the proposed CVSP project, but the significant unavoidable impact would not be avoided.

5.4.1.7 *Energy Use*

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would result in the consumption of less energy when compared to the proposed CVSP project due to the fact that they would result in less development.

5.4.1.8 *Other Impacts*

All other environmental impacts that result from the implementation of the CVSP project would be reduced or avoided by the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios due to the fact that less development would occur on fewer acres. Less traffic would be generated both within and outside of the CVSP Development Area, resulting in fewer traffic impacts at affected intersections. However, it should be noted that utilizing roadway capacity in the reverse commute direction would not be realized to the same extent with the Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios. The corresponding air pollutant emissions, including NOx deposition, would also be reduced. Construction-related and long-term air and water quality impacts and impacts to prehistoric and historic resources would be significantly reduced. Vibration impacts would also be reduced because sensitive land uses could potentially be located away from the UPRR tracks.

While impacts to biological resources including oak woodland, serpentine grasslands, and riparian habitat as well as impacts to special status plant and animals species would be reduced overall, impacts to wetlands located in the southwestern portion of the NCCIA could still be impacted, depending upon the location of development. Because less development is included in these alternative scenarios, impacts associated with wildlife movement would be reduced. Development

within the Urban Reserve would require a flood control system which could result in impacts to existing Fisher Creek, although the creek could be improved by restoration and realignment. These Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios could be implemented without the development of properties on the east side of Coyote Creek, thereby reducing impacts to the Coyote Creek riparian corridor. Finally, impacts associated with development in proximity to an active earthquake fault and properties with potential hazardous materials contamination would also be reduced when compared to the CVSP project, because these areas could be avoided under the Reduced Scale Alternatives II scenarios.

5.4.1.9 *Comparison of the Two Reduced Scale Scenarios*

The CVRP + Residential scenario would result in all of the environmental impacts described in the CVRP EIR, in addition to the impacts of developing additional lands in the Urban Reserve for residential uses. The amount of acreage needed for these residential uses would be dependent upon the development densities. Higher residential densities would allow more properties to remain undeveloped. The residential development could be spread throughout the valley, potentially avoiding some Prime and Important Farmlands and some properties with sensitive cultural and biological resources and hazardous materials. However, as previously described, the avoidance of some properties would result in the development of others and it may not be possible to completely avoid all sensitive/hazardous properties. This is also true of the Smaller CVSP scenario and, in fact, it could be more difficult to avoid these properties because this scenario would be implemented as one cohesive 1,900-acre development footprint.

Both Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would have similar impacts to freeway segments and long-term traffic impacts because the scenarios include the same amount of development that would generate the same number of vehicle trips. It should be noted that incorporating workplace and residential uses into a Smaller CVSP mixed use development would tend to reduce trip lengths and encourage the use of alternative means of transportation such as walking or biking to work. Further, because air pollution in the Bay Area is associated with traffic and traffic congestion, mixing land uses and shortening or reducing vehicle trips would be expected to incrementally reduce air pollutant emissions.

Although the construction of the CVRP itself would result in significant construction-related noise impacts, the CVRP + Residential scenario has the potential to reduce these impacts because development would occur in smaller areas throughout the CVSP Development Area. Existing residential areas could be affected by construction-related noise of either scenario; however, it is anticipated that most of the surrounding land uses would include vacant or farmed lands. Construction of the Smaller CVSP scenario would result in similar impacts as the CVSP project, but on a smaller scale. It is believed that the construction of 20,000 jobs and 10,000 dwelling units would result in significant construction-related noise impacts both to future residents of the Smaller CVSP and to existing residential areas. Traffic-generated roadway noise impacts from the two scenarios are expected to be similar.

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would both generate air pollutants in excess of BAAQMD thresholds, which result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts. Because both scenarios include the construction of residential units not accounted for in the General Plan, neither is consistent with the CAP or 2005 Ozone Strategy.

The CVSP + Residential scenario has the potential to result in fewer impacts to biological resources because the residential uses could be placed so as to avoid sensitive properties. As previously described, however, if biologically sensitive lands are avoided, other lands including farmlands, and sites with cultural and/or hazardous materials issues could be developed. The Smaller CVSP

scenario would have less of a potential to avoid these sensitive properties because of its larger cohesive development footprint.

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would be expected to result in different visual and aesthetic impacts, especially when viewed from scenic roadways. They would include the development of different properties in different densities; however, both would result in significant unavoidable impacts.

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would use similar amounts of energy, although the Smaller CVSP scenario has the potential to require less gasoline because vehicle trips and trip lengths could be reduced by mixing and concentrating land uses in one area. The need for services and utilities would be similar; however, the CVSP + Residential scenario would require that utilities and services be extended across a larger geographical area.

5.4.1.10 *Comparison of NCCIA and CVSP Development Scenarios*

When comparing the development of the NCCIA (Reduced Scale Alternative I scenarios) to the development of some portion of both the NCCIA and Urban Reserve (Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios), it is important to note that the flood control system for the NCCIA is permitted and currently under construction, and was designed to accommodate only the build-out of development allowed in the NCCIA. Any development in the Urban Reserve would require an additional flood control system that could have impacts to existing Fisher Creek. The development of the NCCIA would not require the annexation of property or the expansion of the Urban Service Area boundary. Finally, there are existing development permits for the CVRP project in the NCCIA.

The environmental impacts of developing the CVRP project were previously disclosed in the CVRP EIR and findings were made regarding the significant unavoidable impacts of that project (loss of agricultural land, freeway segments, roadway and construction noise, loss of Heritage Trees, and visual impacts). Therefore, development of the NCCIA would result in fewer environmental impacts than the alternative scenarios that allow the development of portions of the Urban Reserve. While the development of the CVSP + Residential scenario would allow for avoidance of Prime and Important Farmlands, culturally and biologically sensitive properties, and properties with hazardous materials issues within the Urban Reserve, it would not be possible to avoid all of these sensitive properties.

5.4.1.11 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would not be consistent with the basic objective of the CVSP project of constructing at least 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 industry-driving jobs. Some of the other identified objectives of the proposed project, however, could be met with these Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios. The Smaller CVSP scenario could result in the development of a highly livable urban community with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial uses, and other community services in the North Coyote Valley area, although at a smaller scale when compared to the proposed CVSP project. The CVRP + Residential scenario would not be consistent with this objective.

These Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios could be consistent with the project objectives relating to the provision of public facilities, including parks, and preservation of the South Coyote Greenbelt. While the implementation of these scenarios would require General Plan amendments and annexation of the Urban Reserve to the City of San José, the intent of objectives 10 through 16 that relate to the sequencing and financing of development and the provision of affordable housing, could be met with less development within the CVSP Development Area.

It should be noted that these Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios would not improve the City's jobs to housing balance or utilization of the reverse commute roadway capacity to the same extent as the proposed project. In addition, the CVRP + Residential Alternative may not be financially feasible due to the cost of extending infrastructure to specific and possibly separate properties within the Urban Reserve to serve only residential development.

5.4.1.12 *Feasibility*

These Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios, which would consist of developing 20,000 jobs and 10,000 residential uses in the NCCIA and/or Urban Reserve, would be feasible from an approval and implementation standpoint. The CVRP + Residential Alternative may not be financially feasible due to the cost of extending infrastructure to the Urban Reserve solely for residential development. This could result in the cost of infrastructure being reflected in the cost of housing, which could result in prohibitively higher home prices.

5.4.1.13 *Conclusion*

The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios described above would include the development of 10,000 residential units and 20,000 jobs in the NCCIA and Urban Reserve. While these alternatives meet some of the project's goals and objectives and the intent of others, they do not meet the basic objective of planning for a minimum of 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 industry-driving jobs. The Reduced Scale Alternative II scenarios are potentially feasible, and are environmentally superior to the proposed project.

5.5 DESIGN ALTERNATIVE – "GETTING IT RIGHT" PLAN

Prior to the preparation of the CVSP, the Greenbelt Alliance, a local environmental group that works to protect open space and promote communities in the San Francisco Bay Area, prepared a plan for the development of the Coyote Valley based on Smart Growth principles that promote using land efficiently to make vibrant neighborhoods with a variety of housing choices. Specifically, the "Getting it Right" plan seeks to demonstrate how a strong new community can be built in the Coyote Valley that protects the environment and agriculture, reduces sprawl, promotes social equity, and provides for economic vitality. The plan can be viewed on the Greenbelt Alliance's website at www.greenbelt.org/resources/reports/index.html.

The "Getting it Right" plan is similar to the proposed CVSP in many ways. Both plans were prepared based on smart growth principles that build community without encouraging urban sprawl, protect the environment and agriculture, ensure social equity through the dedication of at least 20 percent of all housing as affordable, and promote economic vitality. The "Getting it Right" concept includes the construction of approximately 25,000 housing units and 53,000 jobs with a town center near Bailey Avenue between Monterey Road and Santa Teresa Boulevard. It also includes a dedicated right-of-way for a bus rapid transit and the permanent protection of the South Coyote Greenbelt, similar to the CVSP project.

The main difference between the "Getting it Right" plan and the CVSP is the development densities. The two plans include approximately the same amount of development, but on a significantly different number of acres. The CVSP project includes the net development of approximately 3,000 of the 3,800 acres within north and mid-Coyote Valley. As shown and described in the "Getting-it-Right" plan (pages 9, and 60-73), the net area of development (or "footprint") would be approximately 2,400 acres, which is significantly smaller than the footprint of the CVSP project.

Therefore, in order to construct approximately the same amount of development, the overall densities would be greater with the "Getting it Right" plan.

Other differences between the two plans include the following: 1) the "Getting it Right" plan does not include the development of any of the property between US 101/Coyote Creek and Monterey Road or some of the low-lying foothill areas in the western portion of the valley; 2) it proposes a street network entirely on a grid pattern; 3) it does not include a focal lake or urban canal; 4) it does not propose to relocate Fisher Creek to its historical location; however, it does include a 750-foot wide "Fisher Creek Greenway" for flood water storage and conveyance; and 5) office and industrial uses are located in areas perpendicular to Monterey Road rather than spread throughout the Development Area.

The "Getting it Right" plan would require General Plan amendments for its development, similar to those of the CVSP. Expansion of the Urban Service Area boundary, and prezoning and annexation of the Urban Reserve would also be required.

5.5.1 Comparison of Environmental Impacts

5.5.1.1 *Land Use*

The significant unavoidable land use impacts of the proposed CVSP project include the loss of approximately 2,400 acres of Prime and Important Farmlands in the Development Area. The "Getting it Right" plan includes the protection of approximately 200 acres of farmland in the northern portion, 100 acres in western portion, 20 acres to be integrated into the schools, parks, and open space areas of the Development Area, and 205 acres of farmland east of Monterey Road, for a total of 525 acres. Therefore, the "Getting it Right" plan would result in the loss of approximately 1,875 acres of farmland compared to 2,400 acres with the CVSP project.

As previously described in Sections 5.3 and 5.4, the avoidance of some properties requires the intensification of land use densities on other properties in order to construct the proposed minimum of 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 jobs. Intensifying land uses can result in increased traffic congestion and noise in the immediate vicinity of the developed areas. In addition, as previously described in the Reduced Scale Alternative scenarios, as farmlands are protected, it may not be possible to avoid biologically and culturally sensitive properties and those with hazardous materials issues.

The "Getting it Right" plan would result in the loss of approximately 1,875 acres of Prime and Important Farmlands compared to 2,400 acres that would be lost as a result of the CVSP project. As previously described, keeping the overall level of development constant, but concentrating it on fewer acres, could have certain adverse effects.

5.5.1.2 *Traffic*

As described in Section 4.2, *Transportation and Traffic* of this EIR, the proposed CVSP project would result in significant unavoidable impacts on eight directional freeway segments under project conditions. The CVSP project includes the construction of approximately 26,500 dwelling units and 55,000 jobs, which is slightly higher than the development included in the "Getting it Right" plan. Because the two projects are similar in size, they would be expected to result in similar overall impacts on freeway segments. In addition, the CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would result in similar significant and unavoidable long-term traffic impacts.

5.5.1.3 *Noise*

As described in Section 4.3, *Noise* of this EIR, the CVSP project would result in two significant unavoidable impacts associated with the generation of construction-related and roadway noise. Because the proposed CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would generate a similar number of vehicle trips, off-site roadway noise impacts of the two plans would be similar. In addition, construction noise resulting from the proposed CVSP and "Getting it Right" plan would be similar because approximately the same amount of development would be constructed on a similar number of acres. In addition, it is assumed the two plans would occur over a similar timeframe. The "Getting it Right" plan does not include development on the east side of Monterey Road, thus eliminating potential construction noise impacts to the riparian corridor of Coyote Creek.

It is believed that existing residential areas would be similarly affected by the two plans; however, the "Getting it Right" plan shows some office and park uses in the portions of the Development Area currently developed with residential uses. Nevertheless, for these reasons, the CVSP project and "Getting it Right" plan would result in similar roadway and construction-related noise impacts in most instances.

5.5.1.4 *Air Quality*

Both the CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would generate criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and PM_{10}, resulting in significant unavoidable long-term regional air quality impacts.

Because both projects include residential units not accounted for in the San José 2020 General Plan, they are inconsistent with the CAP and the 2005 Ozone Strategy which is a significant unavoidable air quality impact.

5.5.1.5 *Biological Resources*

Both the CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan have the potential to result in impacts to Burrowing Owls, because they include the development of areas that were not surveyed for Burrowing Owl habitat. As described in Section 4.6, *Biological Resources*, the proposed CVSP project could result in impacts to Burrowing Owls due to loss of individuals during construction, loss of habitat, increased predation, widening and construction of roadways, and nest disturbance. It is estimated that approximately 1,130 acres of Burrowing Owl habitat could be lost with the development of the CVSP, some of which could be located on the east side of Monterey Road. Therefore, it is assumed that the "Getting it Right" plan would result in the loss of slightly less Burrowing Owl habitat, although no owls were located in this area during surveys of accessible properties for the CVSP project. Overall, the two plans would result in similar impacts associated with the loss of habitat and impacts to individual owls.

Based on the tree survey of accessible properties of the CVSP Development Area, the proposed CVSP project could result in the loss of at least 888 ordinance-size trees, potentially including the Keesling walnut trees. The development area of the "Getting it Right" plan is smaller and impacts fewer trees than the CVSP project, due to the preservation of more acres of Prime and Important farmlands, no development on the east side of Monterey Road, and some trees may be protected as part of the Fisher Creek Gateway. It should be noted, however, that the protection of some lands may result in more intense development in other portions of the Development Area. The more intense the development, the less likely it will be that trees are protected within the developed areas.

While the CVSP would develop more acres overall, the "Getting it Right" plan would develop at higher densities overall. The two plans would result in similar impacts to Burrowing Owls and ordinance-size trees because they both would require the development of the Development Area.

5.5.1.6 *Visual and Aesthetics*

The CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would result in significant unavoidable visual and aesthetic impacts due to the conversion of the Coyote Valley, a primarily rural area to urban uses. Both plans would result in higher development densities near the existing Bailey Avenue/Santa Teresa Boulevard intersection, with development densities gradually reducing as the development spreads primarily to the west and south. Both plans would substantially change the existing visual and aesthetic character of the Coyote Valley area, including views from scenic roadways. As previously described, the "Getting it Right" plan would result in the development of fewer acres overall; however, its development density would be greater because it includes approximately the same amount of development as the proposed CVSP project on a smaller land area.

5.5.1.7 *Energy Use*

The CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would result in the use of similar amounts of energy because they would include similar amounts of development with the Coyote Valley. It should be noted that both plans include "Green Building" policies to reduce energy use.

5.5.1.8 *Other Impacts*

The CVSP project and the "Getting it Right" plan would result in approximately the same environmental impacts primarily because they include approximately the same amount of the development within the Coyote Valley. The same amount of traffic would be generated both within and outside of the valley, resulting in similar air pollutant emissions, including NOx deposition and noise. Construction-related and long-term local air and water quality impacts would be similar. In addition, vibration, hydrology, geology, and hazardous materials impacts would be similar. It should be noted that the amount of development included in the "Getting it Right" plan would also require the construction of the Bailey-over-the-Hill roadway extension to the Almaden Valley.

While impacts to biological resources including oak woodland and grasslands would be reduced with the "Getting it Right" plan because these areas would not be developed, impacts to wetlands located in the southwestern portion of the NCCIA would still occur. The "Getting it Right" plan includes a 750-foot wide flood management channel (without riparian habitat restoration) along existing Fisher Creek. The CVSP project would fill existing Fisher Creek through the Development Area, return it to its more historic alignment, and restore the channel to a stable, vegetated riparian corridor, thereby resulting in improvements to the biological functions and values of the creek. Such improvements would not occur under the "Getting it Right" plan. Because a similar amount of development is included in the "Getting it Right" alternative, impacts associated with wildlife movement would be similar.

The "Getting it Right" plan does not include the development of properties on the east side of Monterey Road. The CVSP project includes a 100-foot riparian setback consistent with the City's Riparian Corridor policy, which reduces significant short- and long-term development impacts to the creek to a less than significant level. The prohibition of development near the creek; however, avoids all potential development impacts, including loss of habitat and impacts to special status species. Again, it should be noted that keeping the overall level of development constant, but concentrating it on fewer sites, would have certain adverse effects, including increased traffic

congestion and noise. It should also be noted that both plans include bridges over Coyote Creek in order to connect to future and existing interchanges on US 101.

Both plans have the potential to avoid impacts to prehistoric and historic resources; however, as previously described, as lands are avoided, other lands could be impacted and overall development densities would increase. Impacts to services and utilities, including water supply, would be similar with both plans because they include approximately the same amount of development.

5.5.1.9 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The "Getting it Right" plan would be consistent with the basic objective of constructing at least 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 industry-driving jobs as described in the City Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes statement. The "Getting it Right" plan would result in the development of a highly livable urban community with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial uses, and other community services.

The "Getting it Right" plan would be consistent with the project objectives relating to the provision of public facilities, including schools, parks, and preservation of the South Coyote Greenbelt. The implementation of the "Getting it Right" plan would require General Plan amendments and rezonings, similar to the proposed CVSP project. In addition, the intent of objectives 10 through 16 that relate to the sequencing and financing of development and the provision of affordable housing, could be met with implementation of the "Getting it Right" plan. Finally, it should be noted that the "Getting it Right" plan would improve the City's jobs to housing balance to the same extent as the proposed CVSP project.

5.5.1.10 *Feasibility*

The "Getting it Right" plan, which would consist of developing the same amount of jobs and residential uses as the proposed CVSP project on fewer acres, would be feasible.

5.5.1.11 *Conclusion*

The "Getting it Right" plan would include the development of 25,000 residential units and 53,000 jobs in the Coyote Valley. This alternative may result in the development of less land within the CVSP Development area; however, development densities would be greater overall. It would have the benefit of avoiding certain environmental impacts at various locations, but such avoidance would simultaneously increase environmental impacts at other locations. This alternative is feasible, and is not environmentally superior to the proposed project.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE LOCATION IN NORTH SAN JOSÉ

CEQA encourages consideration of an alternative site when significant effects of the project might be avoided or substantially lessened. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and meet most of the project objectives need be considered for inclusion in an EIR.

In order to identify an alternative site that might reasonably be considered to "feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes" of the project, and would also avoid some or all of the significant impacts of the project, it was assumed that such a site would ideally have the following characteristics:

- Located in the City of San José's Urban Service Area;
- Approximately 3,800 acres in size;
- Not designated as Prime or Important Farmlands;
- Have adequate transit and automobile access;
- Not designated as Burrowing Owl habitat; and
- Be available for development.

There is no known location that meets all of the criteria described above, and which also has the appropriate zoning and/or General Plan designations to allow development at the scale proposed for the CVSP project.

Although the Coyote Valley is primarily undeveloped, an alternative location would not necessarily be vacant land. It should, however, be predominantly industrial or commercial land uses, since the dislocation of a substantial number of existing housing units would create an unacceptable significant impact due to residential relocation and resident displacement. The area which comes closest to meeting most of the criteria is the recently approved (June 2005) North San José Development Policies Update (NSJDPU) project for the approximately 5,000 acre Rincon de los Esteros area of North San José.

The North San José Development Policies Update (NSJDPU) project includes General Plan amendments, policy revisions, and infrastructure implementation necessary to allow the development of approximately 26.7 million square feet (approximately 83,300 jobs) of new industrial/office/R&D building space in the Rincon area – a substantial concentration of high tech and support companies in the "Golden Triangle" of Silicon Valley. In addition, the NSJDPU project includes up to 32,000 new dwelling units at minimum densities of 20, 55, or 90 dwelling units to the acre, depending on location. The new development is expected to increase the population of San José by approximately 56,640 persons. The new development would also require associated commercial uses, infrastructure, and public/quasi-public facilities (including schools, parks, day care centers, and recreational facilities) to be developed in or near the new residential development.

For both areas (North San José and Coyote Valley), there are existing General Plan land use designations and other entitlements in place that would allow some of the projected industrial/office/R&D development to occur under the No Project Alternative condition. The No Project Alternative (CVRP project) would allow the construction of approximately 20,000 jobs and the San Jose 2020 General Plan includes an additional 30,000 jobs in the NCCIA, for a total of 50,000 jobs. The NSJDPU project area is primarily developed with urban uses. Implementation of either the CVSP or NSJDPU project in the Rincon area will require that demolition of existing buildings and infrastructure occur prior to redevelopment with substantially more intense new development.

The discussion below includes a comparative analysis of placing the proposed project in the NSJDPU area, based upon the NSJDPU EIR (March 2005). As described in more detail below, the impacts of the North San José Location Alternative are, in general, less than those of the proposed project, with the exception of traffic. This is because the NSJDPU project represents intensification of a highly urbanized area that is centrally located near congested roadways, whereas the CVSP would place development at a location that is not now urbanized, and is primarily agricultural or fallow land at the southern edge of San José's urban area.

5.6.1 Comparison of Environmental Impacts

5.6.1.1 *Land Use*

The significant unavoidable land use impacts of the proposed CVSP project include impacts from the loss of approximately 2,400 acres of Prime and Important Farmlands in the Development Area. The NSJDPU project area includes approximately 34 acres of designated Prime Farmland. Therefore, the construction of the CVSP project in North San José would result in the loss of significantly fewer acres of Prime Farmland.

5.6.1.2 *Traffic*

As described in Section 4.2, *Transportation and Traffic* of this EIR, the proposed CVSP project would result in significant unavoidable impacts on eight directional freeway segments under project conditions. Feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to study intersections to a less than significant level. The CVSP project would also result in significant long-term traffic impacts.

Traffic impacts of the NSJDPU project will also be substantial, affecting many of the roadways providing access to and from the Rincon area. According to the NSJDPU EIR, the North San José project would result in significant unavoidable impacts to 72 freeway segments. In addition, as with the CVSP project, the NSJDPU project would result in long-term traffic impacts.

The CVSP and NSJDPU projects would both result in significant near- and far-term traffic impacts on roadways within Santa Clara County. The CVSP would result in fewer traffic impacts overall.

5.6.1.3 *Noise*

Overall, because the CVSP Development Area is primarily rural in nature, ambient noise levels in the CVSP Development Area are less than the ambient levels in the NSJDPU. Nevertheless, the NSJDPU and CVSP projects would result in significant unavoidable noise impacts on roadway segments outside of the respective project areas due to a significant increase in noise from project-generated traffic. In addition, both projects would result in significant construction-related noise impacts given the amount of development proposed and the 25- to 50-year timeframe for build-out.

Noise impacts from the demolition of existing land uses would be less in the Coyote Valley because very few structures and very little pavement would require demolition/removal compared to the NSJDPU project. It should be noted that fewer existing sensitive receptors are located within the CVSP that would be affected by long-term roadway and construction-related noise.

5.6.1.4 *Air Quality*

Both the CVSP and NSJDPU projects would generate criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, and PM_{10}, resulting in significant unavoidable long-term regional air quality impacts.

Because both projects include residential units not accounted for in the San José 2020 General Plan, they are inconsistent with the CAP and the 2005 Ozone Strategy which is a significant unavoidable air quality impact.

5.6.1.5 *Biological Resources*

As described in Section 4.6, *Biological Resources*, of this EIR, the proposed CVSP project could result in impacts to Burrowing Owls due to loss of individuals during construction, loss of habitat, increased predation, widening and construction of roadways, and nest disturbance. It is estimated that approximately 1,130 acres of Burrowing Owl habitat could be lost with the development of the CVSP. As described in Section II. E., *Biological Resources*, of the NSJDPU EIR, the NSJDPU project would result in the loss of all of the remaining Burrowing Owl habitat in the Rincon area – a loss of approximately 600 acres of habitat. This loss is also a significant unavoidable impact.

Based on the tree survey of accessible properties of the CVSP Development Area, the proposed CVSP project would result in the loss of at least 888 ordinance-size trees, potentially including the Keesling walnut trees and other native species, including oaks. As stated in the NSJDPU EIR, the development of vacant parcels and redevelopment of landscaped properties having ordinance-size trees could result in the loss of most or all of those trees. Although a tree survey was not prepared for the NSJDPU project, the trees are primarily introduced species. Therefore, the significance of their loss is primarily a function of their substantial numbers which provide localized shading and refuge for birds and other fauna in the area.

The CVSP and NSJDPU projects would both result in impacts to Burrowing Owls and ordinance-size trees because they would require development and/or redevelopment of large development areas. The CVSP would develop more vacant acres overall, therefore, it would result in greater impacts to trees and Burrowing Owl habitat.

5.6.1.6 *Visual and Aesthetics*

Because most of the Rincon area is currently developed, the NSJDPU project would result in the removal of existing buildings, parking lots, and landscaping to be replaced with (in most cases) more intense, taller development, and less landscaping. Vacant properties would be fully developed. Although the NSJDPU project would reduce the views of the surrounding foothills, these views are intermittent and the project would not have a substantial effect on a scenic vista.

In contrast, the CVSP project would result in the conversion of the approximately 3,800 acres of the primarily rural Coyote Valley to urban uses. The CVSP project would substantially change the existing visual and aesthetic character of the Coyote Valley area, including views from scenic roadways. This is a significant unavoidable impact. Visual impacts of the CVSP project would be greater than the North San José Alternative Location.

5.6.1.7 *Energy Use*

The CVSP and NSJDPU projects would result in significant increases in the amount of energy consumed within the City of San José. Although the CVSP project includes commercial and other service development, it would be expected that because the Rincon area is surrounded by existing urbanization, vehicle trip lengths to regional shopping and other activities would be shorter overall. In other words, travel other than commuting to neighborhood shopping and jobs held at nearby sites will require substantially greater use of energy than the same trips made from North San José. In addition, the NSJDPU project would be able to take advantage of existing regional transit access including LRT.

The construction of new infrastructure from "scratch" instead of expansion and supplementing existing infrastructure will require the use of more virgin materials and the expenditure of more energy.

5.6.1.8 *Other Impacts*

Because the CVSP project would be implemented as an integrated plan, the potential for land use compatibility problems between newly built residential projects and existing industrial development would be substantially less than with the NSJUDP project. The CVSP project proposes to retain many of the existing residences in the Development Area and development proposed adjacent to these existing uses would be some of the lowest density residential uses included in the CVSP.

Neither the CVSP nor NSJDPU projects would result in impacts to historic resources. Development that requires subsurface excavation and/or removal of existing structures is likely to impact prehistoric resources, and may disturb prehistoric burials. Both projects will be required to include measures to minimize such impacts, which could be significant. It should be noted that because resources in Coyote Valley have generally remained undisturbed compared to those in the NSJDPU project area, impacts within Coyote Valley may be greater.

As described in Section 4.6, *Biological Resources*, of this EIR, the CVSP project would include the loss of sensitive habitats including wetlands, oak woodlands, and serpentine grasslands. Sensitive special status plant and animal species would also be affected by implementation of the CVSP. The NSJDPU project would result in minimal impacts to biological resources because the project area is developed with urban uses. Because there is relatively little wildlife movement occurring in the NSJDPU area, impacts associated with wildlife movement would be reduced. The US Fish and Wildlife Service contends that airborne nitrogen emissions can adversely affect sensitive serpentine habitats. As described in Section 4.6 of this EIR, an analysis of this impact determined that due to the complex set of chemical reactions that must occur before NOx converts to a particulate form, nitrogen currently deposited in the serpentine hills adjacent to the CVSP Area likely originates from sources far to the north. Therefore, the implementation of the CVSP project at the North San José Alternative Location would not reduce this potential impact.

The potentially active Shannon Fault within the CVSP Development Area indicates that seismic hazards would be incrementally greater in the Coyote Valley when compared to the NSJDPU area. The impacts from existing soil contamination in Coyote Valley are unlikely to be as significant as the impacts to soil and groundwater from industrial releases in North San José. Both projects would result in the placement of industrial uses in proximity to sensitive uses, including residential development, schools, and day care facilities. Mitigation measures will be required for both projects to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Placing substantial amounts of new industrial and residential development in Coyote Valley will require the construction of substantial new infrastructure, including roadways and a flood control system. All utilities, including sanitary, water, electricity, and natural gas would need to be extended to the CVSP Development Area. In addition, the CVSP project would include the construction of one interchange with US 101 and improvements to two other interchanges, and the extension of the BOH roadway extension. These project components would have significant biological and cultural impacts. The NSJDPU project would require expansion and upgrading of existing infrastructure that would also result in significant environmental impacts. For this reason, the environmental impacts of expanding the infrastructure in Coyote Valley and NSJDPU would be comparable.

Constructing the CVSP project within the NSJDPU project area would not utilize roadway capacity in the reverse commute direction and would not improve the functions and values of Fisher Creek within Coyote Valley.

5.6.1.9 *Relationship to Project Goals and Objectives*

The proposed CVSP project could be constructed in the NSJDPU project area. The construction of a minimum of 25,000 dwelling units and 50,000 jobs in North San José, would not however, meet the objectives of the project as described in the City Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes statement because these uses would not be constructed in the Coyote Valley. Although the NSJDPU project area is primarily developed, the basic objective of implementing a plan that would result in the development of a highly livable urban community with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial uses, and other community services could be achievable.

The other objectives of the CVSP project could be met; however, most of the objectives are related to implementing the CVSP *in the Coyote Valley*. For example, constructing the project in North San José could include 20% affordable housing; however, the protection of the Greenbelt area as a non-urban buffer between the cities of San José and Morgan Hill would probably not occur under the NSJDPU Alternative Location, because there is no nexus between the two actions.

5.6.1.10 *Feasibility*

The implementation of the CVSP project in the Rincon area of North San José is feasible; however, several of the objectives of the CVSP project would not be met, as previously described.

5.6.1.11 *Conclusion*

Implementing the CVSP project in the NSJDPU project area would require the construction of most of the infrastructure, public services, and public facilities required to serve the amount of development proposed. Significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of the construction of water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, electrical and natural gas lines. The necessary construction of schools, parks, recreational facilities, and libraries on agricultural land and visual open space could also result in additional significant impacts. Implementation of the CVSP on the NSJDPU project site would not be consistent with many of the project's goals and objectives, including the creation of a community that is highly livable with a variety of housing types, schools, parklands, trails, bicycle paths, transit, commercial and job centers and other community services in the Coyote Valley. This alternative is feasible, and may be environmentally superior to the proposed project for the reasons noted above.

5.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative among those alternatives discussed. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "No Project" Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. [§15126.6(3)(2)]

While the No Project Alternative would result in less impact than the proposed project, the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives identified are the Reduced Scale Alternative I: 20,000 jobs and 10,000 Housing Units in North Coyote Valley as described in Section 5.3 of this EIR.